

REMARKS/ARGUMENTSClaim Status

Claims 1-13 and 42-44 are pending in this application. Claims 1-13 and 42-44 stand rejected. Claims 1, 12, 42, and 44 have been amended by this paper. Claims 4 and 5 have been canceled by this paper. No claims have been added by this paper.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 12, 42, and 44 have been amended to recite that a receive machine which comprises means for generating a message checksum for a message while the message is being received by the bus controller over the system bus. Independent claim 43 already included this limitation. Therefore all independent claims in this application now require a receive machine which comprises means for generating a message checksum for a message while the message is being received by the bus controller over the system bus.

The Office Action relies on Yoshida, col. 11, lines 14-24 to disclose this limitation. Yoshida, however, does not disclose this limitation. Instead, Yoshida states that "the data check code generation circuits 23 and 73 of the data processing unit 6 and the external recording unit 10 start the calculation." As is shown in FIG. 15, the data check code generation circuit 73 is part of the

data processor 6 which *generates* and *transmits* data to the external recording unit 10. The data check code generation circuit 73, therefore, is not a "receive machine" as required by all of the pending claims.

Furthermore, even though the data check code generation circuit 23 is part of the external recording unit 10, which receives data from the data processor, Yoshida discloses that *both* the data check code generation circuits 23 are required to calculate the data check code. Therefore the Yoshida does not disclose a *receive machine* that includes means sufficient to generate a message checksum while the message is being received.

All of the pending claims now include this limitation, either directly or by dependency. The Office Action relies solely on Yoshida for disclosure of this limitation. Therefore all of the pending claims now patentably distinguish over all of the combinations cited by the Office Action.

CONCLUSIONS

Any dependent claims not specifically discussed above depend, either directly or indirectly, from the independent claims discussed above and therefore are patentable for at least the same reason(s).

If the Examiner wishes to discuss this Response, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the phone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for extension of time is otherwise absent, applicant hereby requests any extension of time. Please charge any fees or make any credits, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert Plotkin/

Robert Plotkin, Esq.

Reg. No. 43,861

June 24, 2008

Date

Robert Plotkin, P.C.

35 Corporate Drive, 4th Floor

Burlington, MA 01803

Tel: (978) 318-9914

Fax: (978) 318-9060